

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/612,382	Applicant(s) Bigg et al.
	Examiner Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.

(3) Bourgouin, Andre *lks*

(2) Charles Muserlian *CKM*

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 10, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 5-8 and 18-24

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A general conversation was held regarding the scope of the compounds in claim 18. Applicants will file amendments and remarks supporting their point in a continuing application.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

BRUCK KIFLE, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1624


Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.